



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/691,287 | 10/22/2003 | Brian J. Cragun | ROC920030187US1 | 2240 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------------|
| 46797 | 7590 | 07/02/2007 |
| IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW | | |
| DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 | | |
| 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH | | |
| ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829 | | |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| EXAMINER | |
| PONIKIEWSKI, TOMASZ | |

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2165 | |

| | |
|------------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| 07/02/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/691,287 | CRAGUN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Tomasz Ponikiewski | 2165 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-24, 26, 27 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 17-19, 24 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-16, 20-23, 26 and 29-31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on March 7, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. *A new ground of rejection is set forth below.*

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

2. Claims 9-24, 26-27 and 29-31 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9, 17-19, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bays et al. (US 2003/0018632) in view of Higgins et al. (US 7,143,074 B2).

As per claim 9 Bays et al. is directed to a computer implemented method for providing an indication of an annotation to a portion of a first view of data, comprising:
providing an interface configured to display a second view of data, wherein the second view of data is displayed later in time relative to the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2 shows interface with icons and view selection).

Bays et al. does not teach analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 21, lines 28-34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data because analysis provides means to compare information.

Bays et al., does not teach providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, when a predetermined set of sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, when a predetermined set of sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in

Art Unit: 2165

the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 8, lines 33-36, wherein the "indication" could mean links).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, when a predetermined set of sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data because providing an indication to user makes the use easier and more efficient.

As per claim 17 Bays et al. is directed to a computer implemented method of creating and displaying an annotation associated with an annotated portion of a first view of data, comprising:

providing an interface through which a user selects the annotated portion of the first view of data and creates the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2 shows "interface" with icons, rows and columns; paragraph 0020, lines 1-3).

creating a record containing the annotation and a link to each cell in the annotated portion (Bays et al., paragraph 0020, lines 1-3).

presenting a second view of data, wherein the second view of data is presented later in time relative to the first view of data (Bays et al., paragraph 0081, lines 13-14)

Bays et al. does not teach analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 21, lines 28-34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data because analysis provides means to compare information.

Bays et al., does not teach providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 8, lines 33-36, wherein the "indication" could mean links).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells

visible in the second view of data are visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data because providing an indication to user makes the use easier and more efficient.

As per claim 18 Bays et al. as modified is directed to the predetermined set of cells comprises at least one of:

all the cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2);

a predetermined number of cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2);

a specified set of cells visible in the annotate portion of the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2);

and a predetermined percentage of cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (Bays et al., page 2, paragraph 0022, lines 5-7).

As per claim 19 Bays et al. as modified is directed to the predetermined set of cells is specified by a user via the interface through which the user selects the annotated portion of the first view of data and creates of the annotation (Bays et al., paragraph 0020, lines 1-3).

As per claim 24 Bays et al. is directed to a computer-readable storage medium containing a program for associating an annotation with an annotated portion of a first view of data which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising:

providing first interface through which a user selects the annotated portion and creates the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2 shows "interface" with icons, rows and columns; paragraph 0020, lines 1-3).

creating a link to each cell in the annotated portion (Bays et al., paragraph 0063, lines 6-8, wherein an index keeps pointers to each cell/location).

creating a record containing the annotation and a link to each cell in the annotated portion (Bays et al., paragraph 0020, lines 1-3).

presenting a second view of data, wherein the second view of data is presented later in time relative to the first view of data (Bays et al., paragraph 0081, lines 13-14)

Bays et al. does not teach analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 21, lines 28-34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data because analysis provides means to compare information.

Bays et al., does not teach providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 8, lines 33-36, wherein the "indication" could mean links).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include providing an indication of the annotation to the user, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data because providing an indication to user makes the use easier and more efficient.

As per claim 27 Bays et al. is directed to a system to create and display annotations associated with views of data, comprising:

a processor (Bays et al., page 3, paragraph 0049, line 3);

an application to display views of data (Bays et al., figure 2 shows "interface" with icons, rows and columns; page 4, paragraph 0050, lines 8-9);

a storage medium to store an annotation database to store annotation records (Bays et al., page 4, paragraph 0052, lines 16-17); and

an annotation system configured to

create an annotation for a selected annotated portion of a first view of data displayed by the application, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data (Bays et al., figure 2 shows "interface" with icons, rows and columns; paragraph 0020, lines 1-3),

create cell links to each cell visible in the annotated portion (Bays et al., paragraph 0063, lines 6-8, wherein an index keeps pointers to each cell/location),

create an annotation record containing the annotation and the cell links (Bays et al., paragraph 0020, lines 1-3),

Bays et al. does not teach analyze a second view of data displayed by the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, wherein the second view of data is displayed later in time relative to the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches analyze a second view of data displayed by the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, wherein the second view of data is displayed later in time relative to the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 21, lines 28-34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include analyze a second view of data displayed by the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first

view of data, wherein the second view of data is displayed later in time relative to the first view of data because analysis provides means to compare information.

Bays et al., does not teach provide an indication of the annotation, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

Higgins et al. teaches provide an indication of the annotation, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (Higgins et al., column 8, lines 33-36, wherein the "indication" could mean links).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Bays et al. by teachings of Higgins et al. to include provide an indication of the annotation, when a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data because providing an indication to user makes the use easier and more efficient.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 10-16, 20-23, 26 and 29-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2165

Response to Arguments


6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-24, 26-27 and 29-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tomasz Ponikiewski whose telephone number is (571)272-1721. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on (571)272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100